

I would call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and request that when the RECORD appears tomorrow the gentleman refer to the statement which I made at the beginning of this session today explaining the reason I was making these objections today.

While I am not setting myself up as a censor, while I am on my feet I think there are others present in the Chamber who can concur in what I am attempting to do. I am now soliciting volunteers to assist me in this effort and thereby save some money in the printing of the RECORD and bring about some semblance of order and commonsense in the application of the Rules of the House. I will welcome the cooperation of any Members.

Mr. Speaker, I am not attempting to set myself up as a censor in this regard but I am merely trying to call attention to some of the things that have been going on which I do not think are in the interest of the taxpayers of America.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Could I ask the gentleman, in all kindness and friendship—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be given 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that at this point such unanimous-consent request is not in order and cannot be entertained by the Chair.

VIOLATIONS OF AIRSPACE OVER THE UNITED STATES BY CUBA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard again that the territorial waters of the United States are being violated by Russian trawlers.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called this fact to the attention of the Members of the House as well as to the State Department that the Communists, through Cuba, are also violating the airspace over the United States and have been doing so for some time. The only answer which I have been able to secure from the executive branch of the Government is the fact that the FAA issued a regulation to permit Cuban airlines, nonscheduled, to overfly the United States as long as they landed at one of the major airports, which includes Dulles Airport, located right outside of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I brought to the attention of the Government, and objected as well to U.S. citizens going to Cuba through Mexico for training in subversion. The answer to that was that the Mexican Government would not cut off such travel and that, therefore, we could not cut it off since this was outside the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have communicated with representatives of the executive branch of the Government about this, and the first reply I received was the President's talk yesterday when he said that the United States must, in fact, re-examine its attitude toward Russia; that we must increase our understanding between the United States and Russia. Also, to do this we must increase communications. This evidently means the travel of U.S. citizens to Cuba, the flight of Cuban airplanes over the United States, and even the violation of our territorial waters by Communist trawlers.

OBJECTIONS TO UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] who seems to be acting as minority leader today, the fact that when he says there is some responsibility on the part of the majority leader to protect the rights of the Members of the House with respect to unanimous-consent requests, that that same responsibility devolves upon the minority leader of the House insofar as unanimous-consent requests are concerned.

What caused my objection to the special orders the other day was the fact that for the first time in 15 years I requested a special order, and it was objected to by a Member on the minority side.

Mr. Speaker, I am not being partisan about it, but I am objecting to all special orders.

In view of the fact that it is reported frequently in the press that we will be here until November, if we can keep these special orders from being taken which consume several hours a day, perhaps we can get out in October.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] may be permitted the opportunity in one instance to insert his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein four newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object on the ground that when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is here I think he can make his own request. I, therefore, object to the request of the other gentleman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman already addressed the House for 1 minute today?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets that the gentleman's request is not in order at this time. The Chair wants to be very liberal, but he must enforce the procedures that exist at this particular period of the day's proceedings.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has been denied through the objection of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], that they be included in one request. What I am trying to say is that there are four different subjects, and they could not possibly fit into one request.

Therefore, I want to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that I cannot tie them in together.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman speaking on the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that the gentleman's observations, of course, will be a part of the RECORD.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

(The SPEAKER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter from Ambassador J. H. van Roijen, of the Netherlands, on the death of our late colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.)

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from Dr. J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador, in reference to the death of our late colleague Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 10, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Netherlands Minister of Social Affairs has asked me to transmit to you the expression of his deep-felt sympathy on the occasion of the untimely death of Congressman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania. The Minister wishes me to add that the Netherlands emigration authorities, who owe so much to the late Congressman Walter's interest in their problems and in the plight of the refugees in general, will always remember Congressman Walter with sincere gratitude.

I should be most grateful if this message of condolence could be passed on to the family of Congressman Walter through your kind intermediary.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Speaker,

Very sincerely yours,

J. H. VAN ROIJEN,
Netherlands Ambassador.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the

bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not exceed 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6868, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we present today the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1964. At the outset I should like to express my appreciation to two new mem-

bers of the subcommittee who worked directly on the bill with us this year, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN]. Also, of course, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] who have been on this subcommittee for some years.

I am proud to be able to tell the House that they worked hard and faithfully on this bill, and we have tried to bring our annual housekeeping bill to the membership in as good order and in as good form as is practicable for us to do. We have tried to extend the hearings on the affairs of the Congress in the hearings, so that all who desired to know more of the detail of what we do and why we do it might have that information. We have supported the bill this year with a more lengthy report than usual in a further effort to bring to the membership and to the country more detail about our housekeeping affairs.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before you totals \$140,038,919. This is a reduction of \$8,541,326 from the budget estimate but \$22,020,509 above the appropriations for the same items in fiscal 1963. I include a table here.

Summary of the bill

Group	Appropriations, 1963 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1964	Committee bill, 1964	Committee bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964
House of Representatives.....	\$49,520,130	\$50,772,950	\$50,131,550	+ \$611,420	- \$641,400
Joint Items.....	5,380,660	6,297,815	6,271,369	+ \$800,709	- 26,146
Architect of the Capitol (excludes Senate items).....	10,350,750	31,398,500	30,744,200	+ 14,393,450	- 654,300
Botanic Garden.....	452,000	483,000	462,000	+ 10,000	- 21,000
Library of Congress.....	19,905,340	21,262,400	20,487,800	+ \$882,460	- 764,600
Government Printing Office.....	26,409,530	38,375,880	31,942,000	+ 5,532,470	- 6,433,880
Total (excludes all Senate items).....	118,018,410	148,580,245	140,038,919	+ 22,020,509	- 8,541,326

NOTE.—Includes all appropriations for 1963 (including the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963) and all budget estimates for 1964 for items covered to date of reporting of this bill. Omits all items pertaining to the Senate.

Part of the reason for the increase in the total amount of money provided for in this bill over 1963 has been brought about by the general pay increases common to all the bills and other increased costs, some of which have been caused by an increase in the volume of work in some of the agencies contained in this bill, and the remainder has been because of the inclusion of a number of nonrecurring capital investment items. As a matter of fact, the new nonrecurring capital items in this bill more than exceed \$23 million. The approval of this bill will bring the capital investment program that has been underway on Capitol Hill for the last 15 years much closer to a final windup. The \$20 million provided for in this bill for the new House office building and other improvements, the purchase of a great amount of land, and the clearing of that land, the construction of the House office building and its equipment, and other authorized items will make that total investment to date come to \$114 million. We can now expect a very sizable decrease in this part of the bill next year, even if some other authorized items are finally decided upon for prosecution.

About the only major item we will have left next year in the way of major construction if this bill is approved, so far as we now know, will be about \$4,237,000 to finish up the work around the new House Office Building and the new garage proposed in this bill. Of course, nothing has yet been authorized for a very badly needed new Library Building. And there is the matter of remodeling the two existing buildings.

In addition to the money provided here for carrying on and completing much of the capital investment work, we have in the bill \$8,500,000 as a capital item to bring the revolving fund of the Government Printing Office up to needs. This is an operating item needed to handle the ever-increasing volume of work.

We also have in here one capital investment item that will be nonrecurring of \$2,225,000 to provide for a new water and sewer system for the main Library of Congress Building. The building is 66 years old and the plumbing has become so badly deteriorated that there is no way it can be successfully repaired; we have included this with some other smaller capital items for that institu-

tion. There may be a few other items come along for that old building.

We have deleted a capital item asked for to start a warehouse at the Government Printing Office. That item will probably be back in another year or so. They had to call off the project temporarily until they can bring it into conformity with some of the redevelopment plans currently involved in that area of Washington.

There will probably be a few more items that the Congress will probably be asked to take up in the next few years, having to do with the final completion of the long-range capital investment program that has been undertaken. But that is for the future.

Since the end of World War II, and at the time when this whole program of capital investment will be finished, in probably the next year or so, we will have invested some \$280 million in new land, buildings, tunnels, facilities, and replacements, in all the Capitol properties and other institutions supported in this bill.

It might be helpful to present some information on the New House Office Building. There seems to be more misinformation noised around than there is information. In the hope that I might put the record straight, there are a few statistics in connection with that building I would like to give the House at this time. This is a building that will have a final cost of about \$71 million-plus, with fixtures and equipment running the total overall cost to about \$80,350,000. That includes, besides the building itself, the purchase of the land and building of the sewer under it, the architectural and engineering fees, and the furniture and furnishings. You will recall that earlier this session \$3,500,000 was authorized to buy the furniture and furnishings needed for the New House Office Building, or the Rayburn Building, as it will be known. The figures are on page 13 of the committee report and they are in the printed hearings. This building when completed will have a gross square foot area of 2,375,000 square feet. The gross square foot area, excluding the garage in the building, will be 1,373,000 square feet. The net usable space will be 935,000 square feet. The cubic content of the building will be 33,600,000 cubic feet of space.

The cost of the building, if we are successful in keeping the actual cost to the \$71.5 million figure that now seems possible, will average approximately \$30 per square foot of gross space. The cost per cubic foot of space on this cost figure will be \$2.13. The national average for comparative buildings as given by the Engineering News Record, December 1962, which is supposed to be an authority, is \$29.13 a square foot and \$2.10 a cubic foot. That means that the cost of this building is almost exactly that of the national average for comparable types of buildings.

To give a little better comparison, these are underway in the city of Washington now certain Government buildings that are costing more than \$30 a square foot, and there are many privately constructed office buildings going up in this part of the country and other metropolitan areas costing more than the \$30 average.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 6: 33: *Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.*

O Thou blessed and eternal God, inspire us daily with new vistas of outlook and new ventures of faith.

Give us a clear vision of our high vocation as coworkers with Thee in building the social order in the principles of righteousness and justice.

Show us how we may safeguard and develop the material resources and interests of our beloved country but above all may we seek to protect and promote its moral and spiritual values.

May we be sensitive and responsive to the many needs of suffering and struggling humanity and be eager to have them enjoy the blessings of the kingdom of God.

In the name of our blessed Lord we offer our prayers of praise and petition. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 521. An act to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children;

S. 522. An act to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers;

S. 525. An act to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; and

S. 526. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the Appendix in five instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the inclusion in the Appendix of the Record in five instances, it is my intention, after much reflection, and in the interest of

economy, fairness, and commonsense, and in the hope that this action will direct attention to the desirability of adopting rules regulating the insertion and extension of extraneous material, both in the body and in the Appendix of the Record, to object to unanimous-consent requests for the extension of remarks in the Appendix of the Record when such requests exceed more than one such request on any single legislative day.

By way of explanation I would like to point out that up to today the cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the 5 months period the 88th has been in session has exceeded more than \$1¼ million.

On one single day, Tuesday of last week, the cost exceeded \$27,000. While I am not objecting to the expenditure of funds for any essential service in Congress, I would point out that a large portion of this cost has been occasioned by the printing of speeches, many times including extraneous and in some cases irrelevant matter, and by the extension of remarks in the Appendix by Members who are not even interested sufficiently to appear on the floor of the House, and therefore, have such requests made by a second and even a third party. In such cases the Record ceases to be an account of the proceedings or debates in this House. Over the past few years the Appendix has ceased to conform to its original purpose, and has become instead a "catchall" for what I have previously described as "trash, tripe, and trivia," the publication of which cannot be justified by any reasonable standards.

I have long felt, and on occasions have introduced legislation which would have placed reasonable limitations on the use of the Appendix, as well as the body of the Record, which I believe would save many hundreds of thousands of dollars and possibly millions of dollars each year.

Other Members have also recognized the abuses, but unfortunately, no steps have been taken to correct the abuses which continue to mount. That is why I am proposing today to object to the extension of remarks by any Member who does not confine his unanimous-consent request to one instance on any legislative day, and to object to any such request when it is made by one Member on behalf of another Member who is not interested enough to appear on the floor of the House to make such request in person.

I would also propose to object to the inclusion of extraneous matter in the body of the Record when it is in the form of newspaper or periodical articles, editorials or other printed material, other than short excerpts from the same. This objection would also apply to testimony given before committees, speeches made by persons other than

Members of Congress; tabulations taken from other Government publications or committee reports which are readily available to anyone who is interested.

Mr. Speaker, I think by this objection there will be reflected, for at least a few days, the saving that can be made if we adopted realistic rules.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] may revise and extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in one instance.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Abernethy	Gray	Pillion
Ayres	Gubser	Powell
Baring	Halpern	Rivers, S.C.
Bray	Harris	Roybal
Brock	Hawkins	St Germain
Broomfield	Healey	Schadeberg
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Schneebeil
Brown, Ohio	Hollifield	Senner
Buckley	Horton	Shelley
Cameron	Kastenmeter	Sheppard
Chelf	Kilburn	Springer
Clausen	McDade	Thompson, La.
Cohelan	Martin, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Trimble
Dawson	Mathias	Whitten
Diggs	Michel	Williams
Dorn	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Forrester	Nelsen	Wilson,
Frelinghuysen	Ostertag	Charles H.
Goodell	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COAST GUARD CONFIRMS SOVIET TRAWLERS VIOLATED U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS OFF FLORIDA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10033

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment, according to the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, June 13, 1963.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, June 11, 1963:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be medical directors

Alice M. Waterhouse	James H. Baxter
David Frost	David Brand
Lynn L. Fulkerson	Milton Zises
George N. Wagnon	Robert C. Lam
Walter C. Clowers	Howard L. McMartin
John R. McGibony	Charles M. Grace
Charles S. McCammon	Dale C. Cameron
Richard A. Malmgren	Celia W. Tabor
Roger K. McDonald	Leon Sokoloff
Andrew G. Morrow	Wesley W. Wleland
Robert O. Scow	

To be directors

Charles E. Smith	Harry J. Kunstadter
James F. Scott	Sidney J. Winter
William J. Pennoyer	Charles P. White
Oscar B. Tate	

To be sanitary engineer directors

William A. McQuary	Charles R. Bowman
James D. Williams	Earl H. Arnold
Aleck Alexander	Keith S. Krause
Clyde F. Fehn	Lloyd W. Gebhard
Frederick S. Kent	

To be pharmacist directors

Henry L. Verhulst
Reede M. Ames

To be senior pharmacists

Cornellius B. Kelly, Jr.	Frank E. Dondero
Milton W. Skolaut	Allen J. Brands

To be scientist directors

Frederick F. Ferguson	Robert J. Fitzgerald
Raymond L. Laird	Paul P. Weinstein
Floyd O. Atchley	William B. Cherry
Bernard Brookman	Harvey I. Scudder
Fay M. Hemphill	Joseph H. Schubert
Walter L. Newton	Charles R. Joyce
Geoffrey M. Jeffery	Morris Goldman
R. Edward Bellamy	Richard B. Eads

To be senior scientist

Joseph B. Margolin

To be sanitarian directors

Richard F. Clapp	Louis J. Ogden
Darold W. Taylor	Kent S. Littig

To be senior sanitarians

Clarence E. Calbert	George A. Amundson
Harold E. Thompson, Jr.	Charles E. Gerhardt
	Samuel M. Rogers

To be nurse directors

Josephine I. O'Connor	Jeannette E. Potter
Emily M. Smith	Jane Wilcox
M. Estelle Hunt	Josephine K. Fitzpatrick
Esther Kaufman	
Apollonia O. Adams	Maria B. Rementeria
Ann F. Matthews	

To be senior nurse officers

Helen Grosskopf	Anastasia M. Zahler
Walborg S. Wayne	Florence J. Ullman
Jean W. Gray	Mary F. Luvist
Agnes V. Herrington	Elsie K. Y. Ho
Gladys M. Ray	Dorine J. Loso
Elizabeth G. Sullivan	Elizabeth Kuhlman
Agnes H. Des Marais	Faye G. Abdallah
Marie D. Grant	Elizabeth J. Haglund
Ellnor D. Stanford	

To be dietitian director

Engla J. Anderson

To be senior dietitians

Margaret V. Vance	Susanne C. Van
Dorothy M. Youland	Leuzen
Jeanne L. Tillotson	

To be therapist director

Eleanor G. Loomis

To be senior therapists

Martha D. Collins
Edith W. Palmer

To be senior health services officers

William H. Redkey	Evelyn Walker
Margaret E. Heap	Heber J. R. Stevenson
Stanley I. Hirsch	

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard advised me late yesterday afternoon that two Soviet trawlers had violated U.S. territorial waters near the southeast Florida coast. According to the Coast Guard, one violation occurred Saturday, one occurred yesterday. The violation which occurred yesterday put the trawler at 2.2 miles off Port Everglades, Fla., and passing through an area of the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Laboratory at the port.

In each case the trawlers were kept under close surveillance as they moved down the coast toward Cuba.

Although I have reported similar violations to the proper authorities in Washington on several previous occasions, this marks the first time such violations have been officially confirmed.

What has been done about them? A check with the Departments of Defense and State this morning gave the answer—nothing.

This is a ridiculous set of conditions for this Government to operate under. A violation of U.S. airspace would be met with blistering protest. These violations are of the same order, and should be met with appropriate action.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire as to the length of the extraneous material that is to be included with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a relatively short article from the Geneva correspondent of the New York Times on trade matters. I would judge it does not consume more than a column.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would call the gentleman's attention to the statement I made a minute ago on the floor of the House. I will object to that matter appearing in the body of the Record, but I will not object to its appearing in the Appendix.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday,

June 13, 1963, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include therein the remarks of Hon. Edward R. Murrow at East Carolina College yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to remind the gentleman again that I am objecting to the inclusion of remarks in the body of the Record which should appear in the Appendix, where they are readily available to the public. I shall object to including them in the body. I will not object to including them in the Appendix.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I amend my request in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina to insert his remarks in the Appendix and to include extraneous matter?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SPECIAL ORDER REQUESTED

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, June 13, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and all other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my very good friend from Missouri, and he is my very good friend, would give me his reason for objecting to my request to extend my remarks in the Appendix in four instances and to include extraneous matter. The gentleman would not object to my extending my remarks in one instance, but does object

to my extending my remarks in more than one instance. What is the reason?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman had heard my remarks made at the opening of the House today he would understand that I am trying to bring some reasonableness into the use of the Appendix of the Record. I think the gentleman can accomplish his purpose by asking for one extension. I think if he will read my remarks he will agree with what I am trying to do. I am trying to save a million dollars a year. I think we can do that without unduly harming any Member of this House or restricting him in any reasonable requests he may make.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it may be interesting for the gentleman to know that I have not inserted any remarks in the Appendix of the Record for the past several weeks. I cannot see any reason why the gentleman should not withdraw his objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I announced earlier today that I was going to follow this policy until we can reach some agreement on a reasonable procedure.

NATIONAL REFERENDUM ON A NATIONAL LOTTERY

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute of Public Opinion, better known as the Gallup poll, recently conducted a nationwide poll on the question of State-run lotteries. The results of this survey show that 51 percent of our adult population favors a State-run lottery to help pay the cost of government.

This nationwide poll further shows that while 10 percent of the people interviewed offered no opinion, only 39 percent opposed lotteries run by their State. Another interesting part of the survey shows that Protestants are almost evenly divided—43 percent for a State-run lottery and 46 percent opposed to this type of proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that if the American taxpayers were given an opportunity to vote on the question of a national lottery as a means of cutting taxes, the percentage would be much higher in support of a Federal lottery.

In view of the reluctance and the unfounded fear among Members of Congress that a national lottery bill is a hot potato, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to report out my bill, H.R. 4026, which provides for a national referendum on this question. We did it recently for the farmers on the wheat issue; why not for all voters on the lottery question?

I am also certain that, given the chance, a vast majority of the American taxpayers will express full support and approval to a Government-run lottery. Overwhelming support of this proposition will represent a clearcut mandate to the Congress for favorable enactment of a national lottery.

June 11

10036

Let us give the American voters a chance to voice their opinion on the question of how to raise additional revenue. Let them decide whether this type of painless and voluntary taxation is not a more palatable substitute for the burdensome taxes they now shoulder. Are we afraid of the results?

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS

(Mr. BARRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days the House may once again consider Philippine war damage claims.

This issue has disrupted the normal friendly relations existing between the Government of the Philippines and the Government of the United States—a disruption caused by selfish interests trying to exploit deep feelings of love and respect held by Filipinos and Americans for each other.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues, who apparently were interested in certain news reports prior to the former passage of the bill to read the following five articles that recently appeared in the press.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair state the question.

The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks, and what?

Mr. BARRY. And include five editorials that have appeared in the newspapers with respect to the Philippine war damage claims bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to that appearing in the Appendix. I do object to its appearing in the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Objection to the latter request is heard.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the five editorials appear in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF HUNGARY TO UNITED NATIONS

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 I called attention to a telegram sent to me by Mr. Christopher Emmet, one of the officers of the Captive Nations Organization, warning me and Members of the House that the government of Mr. Kadar, of Hungary, was shortly to be admitted to the United Nations with full rights of membership.

At the time I told several of my colleagues in the House that I intended to watch this and follow through on the proceedings. They were a little doubtful. It was their right. They thought probably it was not true, that it was an erroneous report.

I should like to tell the House that last week this became an accomplished fact, and that the delegation of the United States abstained from voting. It would seem almost better to support the Hungarian regime than merely to abstain in a weak-kneed manner and allow them to come into the U.N. This is the same government that slaughtered freedom-loving Hungarians not long ago. This is the same government that has held Cardinal Mindszenty captive in our legation.

Mr. Speaker, I think this has been very unfortunate, and that our stand in the matter is deplorable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record in one instance and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not speaking loud enough to be heard. The Chair did not state the request of the gentleman from Iowa. I think there is a deliberate move to try to avoid objection. I reserve the right to object to this request until it is stated in terms that can be understood.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record in one instance and include extraneous matter about legislation which we are going to take up on the floor of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, you know when these new problems of procedure come up, it is often wise for ordinary Members of the House to inquire among friends just what the rules are. The rules seem to have been changed on the insertion of extraneous material either in the body of the Record or in the Appendix.

I would like to inquire of my good friend who has been making some few objections just what the rules are. For example, when our mutual good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman GAVIN, requested unanimous consent to place his remarks including four inserts into the Appendix of the Record and to include extraneous material from newspapers, the objection was made. Then the gentleman from

New York, Congressman BARRY, likewise a Republican and likewise a good friend of all of us, asked unanimous consent to put his remarks in the body of the Record including extraneous material in four instances. Objection was going to be made, that this could not be done under these new rules, but if the remarks including the four inserts were put into the Appendix of the Record there would be no objection. Therefore, under such rules we have the Gavin request ruled one way and the Barry request the other—both good friends and both Republicans, so there was no partisan consideration. How does this result occur? I would appreciate hearing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there has been no change whatever in the rules of the House. When unanimous-consent requests are made, objections may be made by any Member of the House and, of course, that is no change in the rules of the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I really was not questioning the majority leader on the change of the written House rules because I know, as you do, there are none since the rules of this Congress were adopted and we have every respect for your leadership. But on the other hand, when we have the fine, self-appointed angels who are making rules by practice from the well of the House, I think we ought to inquire.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE BODY OF THE RECORD, IN THE APPENDIX OF THE RECORD AND TO INCLUDE EXTRANEEOUS MATTER

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] the distinction between the requests made by the two gentlemen to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] referred, is this:

In part 1, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] asks for permission to extend his remarks in four instances in the Appendix of the Record. The other request was to extend remarks, in one instance, and to include four articles.

Mr. Speaker, that might represent a fine distinction but there is a limitation on the amount that can be expended on any one extension in the Record.

cern for the Christian church and the welfare of his communicants, Pope John more recently embarked on a program of ameliorating the conditions of Catholics, and of all people, behind the Iron Curtain.

Pope John XXIII was a man who will go down in history as one who changed the course of our race. Since he became Pope, we humans bound like lemmings upon a headlong descent upon self-destruction, have resumed a search for saner, more peaceful paths.

I pray that his successor may follow the same policies and be guided by the same lasting principles as was Pope John XXIII.

REDESIGNING OF 5-CENT GEORGE WASHINGTON STAMP

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently I introduced a companion bill, S. 1571, which was initiated by Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE (H.R. 3992) which will incorporate into the present 5-cent George Washington stamp the quotation "To bigotry no sanction."

Shortly after the introduction of this legislation, Senator NEUBERGER introduced legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor, in support of a crusade against cancer commemorative postage stamp. In Senator NEUBERGER's statement she included a recent New York Times editorial which commented on the present design of the 5-cent George Washington postage stamp. The editorial pointed out the necessity for redesigning the George Washington stamp, and I should like to associate myself with Senator NEUBERGER's remarks in this regard, for I, too, believe the George Washington 5-cent stamp should be redesigned. And, I am hopeful at this time that the Post Office Department will interject into the design those words which George Washington wrote to the congregation at Touro Synagogue in my home city of Newport, R.I.—"To bigotry no sanction."

NEW POLICY ON CUBA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is mounting dissatisfaction with our policy toward Cuba, and it is being increasingly expressed in calls for clarification and action. A special conference in New York at the end of April, attended by 25 specialists in Latin American affairs and other areas of U.S. foreign policy, discussed this problem at a 3-day session under the auspices of Freedom House, and recommended prompt action to remove Castro and the Soviet troops in Cuba. There are many forms of action to be employed, other than all-out invasion and unilateral force, according to the report issued by the conference—already inserted in the Record by my distinguished colleague Senator Dodd—which was highly critical of our present policy.

The noted political commentator, Roscoe Drummond was a member of the conference; and the conclusions expressed in his syndicated column reflect the discussions in which he participated. I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD the article, by Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Kennedy and Cuba: Change in Policy Needed," which appeared in the Washington Post of June 10.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 10, 1963]

KENNEDY AND CUBA (By Roscoe Drummond)

President Kennedy, I feel sure, will not long condone a passive, timid policy of accepting the Soviet military presence in Cuba with the clear implication that little can be done about it except to try to keep it from spreading further into the Western Hemisphere.

There are two reasons why this policy needs to be charged and, I believe, will be changed.

One reason is that it isn't working; the wall isn't holding. Soviet-supported Castro subversion and sabotage of neighboring Caribbean countries is mounting. Its intensification dates from the Soviet takeover of the Castro regime last fall. Castro has explicitly and openly made Venezuela his first target. Last week Venezuelan Communists successfully raided and burned the U.S. Military Mission in Caracas.

The second reason why administration policy cannot long remain passive is that the American people will not, I think accept it. Unless the do-little Cuba policy is changed in the course of the coming months, it will be a central issue in the presidential election and the country will have the opportunity to register its verdict—yes or no—at the polls.

New evidence that containment is not containing comes from the eight-nation investigating committee of the Council of Organization of American States, whose officials are neither alarmist nor given to overstatement. Their latest findings are:

That Cuban based subversion in Latin America "has increased considerably during the past year."

That the Communist offensive, with the aid of training, money, and propaganda from the Cuba base, is being steadily "intensified."

That there is "no real awareness on the part of the American countries of the danger to their own security in taking a passive attitude" toward the Communist activity.

This is straight talk—and welcome. It runs counter to the cozy and soporific attitude one encounters in many places in the administration; namely, that if we will only hold our breath—and our tongues—the Soviet forces in Cuba will go away and that, anyway, since they can't attack the United States, there's nothing much that needs to be done.

Is it a valid assumption that the Soviet presence in Cuba is only a negative force, a kind of umbrella against invasion, just a prop to Castro?

The OAS committee repudiates this comforting theory.

It declares that the Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere "results mainly from the intensification of Soviet military power in Cuba."

It reports that "the utilization of the island as a base for promoting subversive activities in other countries" stems largely from the fact that "Cuba has now been converted into a Soviet military base."

It deserves to be noted that President Kennedy himself has never said that he intended to acquiesce indefinitely in the presence of Soviet forces in Cuba. But I have listened to very high officials saying that we will have to "live with their presence a long time," that "they may never get out," that the American people have a kind of "neurotic preoccupation with Cuba."

I do not believe that President Kennedy can long live with such a policy. All the American people need to know is that he does not intend to do so. They are prepared to leave with the President the timing and the means of acting once they become certain he intends to act.

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN THE INDIANA DUNES STRUGGLE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the Indiana dunes published in the Paddock Publications of Arlington Heights, Ill., on June 6, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN THE INDIANA DUNES STRUGGLE

(By Tom Edwards)

"The dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite is to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity: Once lost, the loss would be irrevocable."—Carl Sandburg.

Today giant machines are clawing away at Indiana's remaining dunes, loading the sand on barges, and finally dumping it into Lake Michigan off Northwestern University's campus in Evanston.

The educational institution wants the sand to create additional acreage to its campus and is paying \$6,300,000 to have it created in the lake.

Bethlehem Steel Corp. is leveling the dunes to build a \$250 million steel finishing plant, it says.

There has been a battle of national scope for several years between those who wish to save about 6½ miles of the dunes remaining on Indiana's 42-mile shoreline, and those who want industrial development. Apparently the conservationists were gaining ground until the Northwestern University contract for sand exploded on the scene last year.

The dunes weren't always there. Their formation began about 11,000 years ago as a result of a great glacier moving down from the north. Since then the inexorable wind and currents of Lake Michigan have gradually and unceasingly heaved sand into Indiana's dunes.

There are other dunes. They occur from Petoskey, Mich., to the Indiana State line, with the Sleeping Bear dunes of northern Michigan excelling in sheer grandeur.

But for quiet beauty and exotic biology, it is the Indiana dunes that have been extolled by naturalists and botanists for nearly half a century.

It is the only duneland that lies within easy driving range of the 7½ million people in the Chicago metropolitan area (40 miles from the Loop).

Yet its potential as a recreational area has been relatively untapped.

What is classified as duneland once stretched for about 25 miles along the 42-mile Indiana shoreline. Until recent excavation work began, about 6½ miles were left, including about 11,000 acres. At the eastern end of the former 25-mile dune shoreline is the 2,182-acre Indiana Dunes State Park, a 3-mile strip along the shore.

But the heart of and choicest duneland lies just to the west of the park. Much of it is now owned by Bethlehem Steel. It probably isn't fate that the choicest area still survives. It is the most rugged, and posed more development problems. But it is now practically the only portion of the Indiana shoreline that hasn't been consumed by development.

It may well have been the cheapest real estate available and suitable to Bethlehem

Steel's purposes when it first bought a chunk in 1956.

Behind the controversial industrial development proposal are morally depressing revelations—February, 1963, issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*—of an intertwining of political and business interests. Many millions of dollars were at stake in various ways. It seems that any objective analysis by the Indiana State government as to the best use of the remaining duneland would be a practical impossibility.

There are probably few—if any—areas in the United States that fit the general priority considerations contained in the recent report of President Kennedy's Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission more than the Indiana dunes.

They are in a huge population center in critical need of publicly owned land for recreation; they contain an incomparable fresh water shore and beachline, the widest in North America, it is reported; and they contain natural phenomena and combinations not duplicated anywhere on the continent.

"A beach is the greatest tourist attraction in the world. National parks are runners up," the Rand McNally Vacation Guide states.

The present Indiana Dunes State Park contains about 3 percent of the total park area in the State—but gets about 25 percent of the human traffic to them, the Louisville (Ky.) *Courier-Journal* reported, while putting to shame Indiana newspapers in exposing the total picture.

Indiana and Illinois are near the bottom of the list of States in the amount of State parks they have supplied their populations. Since 1940 the Federal Government has only increased its national park acreage by about an infinitesimal .005 percent. That is 200 times less than 1 percent. (The Indiana and the Sleeping Bear Dunes are 2 of 29 new national parks the Federal Government is contemplating now.)

Biologically, the dunes contain flora and fauna ranging from desert cactus to Arctic plants. It is a biological island which has long intrigued botanists. More than 1,000 species of plants, including 28 members of the orchid family, grow there, and 256 species of birds have been observed there. One might question if Northwestern University and the proposed steel mills are intrinsically as important.

The first Director of the National Park Service, Stephen T. Mather, visited the Indiana Dunes in 1916 and proposed a 25-mile preserve there. But World War I intervened. In 1925 the State established the present 2,182-acre dunes park.

"In 1929, Midwest Steel Corp. bought 750 acres straddling Burns Ditch, an artificial channel dug 3 years earlier to drain the Little Calumet River," the *Courier-Journal* reported.

In 1931 and 1935 the Army Engineers recommended against the use of Federal funds for a Burns Ditch harbor proposed by Midwest Steel, the article continues.

In 1944 the Army Engineers again stated that the existing harbor facilities in the area were adequate. But in 1960, Col. J. A. Smedile, the Army district engineer, announced that a port at Burns Ditch could be economically justified. But, according to sundry accounts and a statement by Colonel Smedile, alternative sites have not been studied.

A comparative study of possible Indiana port sites was finally authorized by the U.S. House of Representatives last year.

But Bethlehem Steel wasn't interested in waiting for it. Early last year Bethlehem, a dredging firm, and Northwestern University contracted to take 2,500,000 cubic yards of sand from Bethlehem owned dunes. The dredging firm will pay Bethlehem \$20,000 for the sand.

When this was announced, an offer was made to give free to the university for lake fill the material to be dredged from the Cal-Sag Canal. About 10 million cubic yards were to be dredged from the canal, it was reported at that time, and will be otherwise dumped along its banks.

The university board of trustees announced May 2, 1962, that it is their normal obligation to fulfill the contract from which the dredging firm would not release them, according to reports. It has also stated that the Cal-Sag material is not suitable for its purpose.

Until the Northwestern University contract was made, it appeared that the Save-the-Dunes Council, a citizens' group organized in 1952, had a good chance to do just that. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, had proposed bills in 1958 to create a national park in the dunes.

Senator DOUGLAS has ardently crusaded to preserve the dunes. He presently has a bill in the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on the Interior for a 9,000-acre national park (in addition to the 2,100-acre State park). He got 16 Senators to cosponsor the bill. They are now waiting for a Bureau of the Budget decision on the Burns Ditch harbor before pressing the bill further, DOUGLAS stated May 20.

Last year both Indiana Senators were in favor of the Burns Ditch harbor. But Senator Homer Capehart was defeated for reelection last November, and new Senator BIRCH BAYH hasn't yet committed himself all the way.

For the proposed harbor, the Federal Government is being asked to put up \$25.5 million and the State government, \$38 million. The Federal Government has so far refused and the State government has declined to shoulder the burden alone.

It has been stated that 94 percent of the potential tonnage that would be handled in the port would be for the sole benefit of of the Midwest and Bethlehem steel mills. Further, it might very well cost the State \$3 million a year to maintain the port. The two steel companies would probably be given free access to the port, with other users to pay.

Another point is that employment in steel production is currently off about 30 percent, and automation is growing.

Pollution of the entire Indiana lakeshore is another likelihood in the future if present development proposals are consummated, as anyone who has witnessed ports of the Great Lakes can attest.

Indiana presently has four ports, three serving the steel producing area of Gary, Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago, and one in Michigan City. There is reliable evidence that these port facilities should be expanded rather than building a new port at Burns Ditch. Indiana ports already handle more tonnage "than any other State in the area," according to the *Martinsville, Ind., newspaper*.

If the steel companies decide to go it alone at Burns Ditch, there remains a question of when do public prerogatives supersede private prerogatives.

On the surface, it seems Indiana would do better to develop one fine major port and industrial complex, even if it means public condemnation of property held by real estate speculators, than to foster a string of submajor, or even second-rate ports.

"The creation of virtually every national park has been fought by local groups for one reason or another and, had their views prevailed, we would have had virtually no national parks or, indeed, State parks either," Senator DOUGLAS said.

THE SOUTH'S GREAT VICTORY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, our most pressing social prob-

lems usually become less pressing when we establish even basic communication among those who are in disagreement. Harry Golden—editor, author, lecturer—is one of those in our Nation today who is trying to increase communication in what he describes as the most important human relations story of the 20th century, the struggle to give full citizenship to all of our citizens.

On June 5, Mr. Golden made a commencement address to Negro graduates at the Morris Brown College in Atlanta, Ga. Once again he made a plea for mutual understanding and for exchange of ideas. He also paid particular attention to the role that education will play in achieving final, full equality. Mr. President, this address was a memorable, timely commentary. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUTH'S GREAT VICTORY

(Commencement address by Harry Golden, Morris Brown College, Atlanta, Ga., June 5, 1963)

It is customary for the commencement speaker to tell his audience that "commencement" means "beginning," the beginning of a new phase in the life of each of the graduates. But if those graduates are Negroes, and the year is 1963, we must add the highly significant fact that an entire race is participating in this commencement—a beginning so momentous that it is impossible for us to realize its full significance at this moment. In the next generation the grandchildren will envy those of their ancestors who had had some participation in this most important human relations story of the 20th century.

And this is an advantage over those who insist that we maintain a caste system in America. No present-day segregationist will ever gather his grandchildren around him and speak with pride of the good fight he waged against human dignity and against history. There is an impossible task, because the chances of winning a fight against history are even less promising than the chances of winning a fight against the Constitution of the United States.

And since history itself is not an adequate scapegoat the devil needs to be more easily identified and so many of the folks say that the U.S. Supreme Court is Communist inspired, that the Justices have been brainwashed, and presumably this includes all future appointees to the U.S. Supreme Court. If they must have a scapegoat I would suggest that the segregationists put the blame on the early Baptist and Methodist missionaries who converted the Negroes to Christianity. These missionaries failed to tell the Negro that there was a class Christianity. These missionaries failed to tell the Negro that there was a class A Christianity for whites and a class B Christianity for Negroes.

But you will notice that Chief Justice Earl Warren is the more convenient devil and that you rarely hear criticism of the late Chief Justice Fred Vinson, a southerner.

It was Vinson who really struck the first blow against the *Redd Scott* decision and the later separate but equal idea. In the *Sweatt* case, Justice Vinson ruled that education involves more than facilities; that first of all it involves a free choice; that most of the Negro students aspiring to become lawyers in Texas would choose the University of Texas Law School at Austin if they had a free choice. The Justice ruled that the education of an individual involves also